

REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 2, 2002 with claims 1 through 33. Claims 1 through 33 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31-33 are proposed to be amended herein.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 19, 20, 22, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garudadri et al. (United States Patent Number 6,671,669), rejected claims 11-18, 23-30, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murveit et al. (United States Patent Number 6,766,295), rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view
10 of Baker (United States Patent Number 6,122,613), rejected claims 3, 10, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Murveit et al., and rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Chao Chang et al. (United States Patent Number 6,567,778). The Examiner also indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including
15 all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants note that the Examiner referred to Murveit et al. as having United States Patent Number 6,671,669; Applicants assume the Examiner meant to refer to United States Patent Number 6,766,295.

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error.

20 Independent Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31-33

Independent claims 1, 19, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garudadri et al., and claims 11, 15, 23, 27, and 32-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murveit et al.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Garudadri discloses
25 providing said speech to a plurality of speech decoders, each of said decoders using a speaker model for one of said speakers and generating a confidence score for each decoded output (FIG. 1 or referring to col. 8, lines 33-67). Regarding claim 11, the Examiner asserts that Murveit discloses providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system (FIGS. 3-5
30 or col. 4, line 1, to col. 5, line 67); and decoding said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is

unknown (elements 206, 208, and 210 in FIG. 3),

Applicants note that Garudadri is directed to providing speech to a plurality of speech engines in a system to get better recognition accuracy (see, Abstract). Garudadri does not disclose or suggest, however, a plurality of speakers wherein each speech engine *corresponds to a different one* of the speakers. Independent claim 1, 19, and 31, as amended, requires providing said speech to a plurality of speech decoders, each of said decoders using a speaker model corresponding to a different one of said speakers.

Applicants note that Murveit teaches to utilize a speaker independent model or a speaker dependent model (see, FIG. 3, blocks 206, 208, 216 and FIG. 5, blocks 206, 208, 216). Independent claims 11, 15, 23, 27, and 32-33, as amended, require providing said speech to a speaker independent and a speaker specific speech recognition system *substantially simultaneously*. Thus, Murveit actually teaches away from the present invention by teaching to provide the speech to *only one* of the speaker models.

Applicants also note that Garudadri teaches to combine the results of a plurality of speech engines (see, Abstract), and thus does not disclose or suggest selecting one speech engine (does not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system). Garudadri also does not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is unknown, and does not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker specific speech recognition system with a speaker model for an identified speaker until there is a speaker change.

Thus, Murveit et al. and Garudadri et al. do not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a plurality of speech decoders, each of said decoders using a speaker model corresponding to a different one of said speakers and generating a confidence score for each decoded output, as required by independent claims 1, 19, and 31, as amended, do not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system substantially simultaneously and decoding said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is unknown, as

required by independent claims 11, 23, and 32, as amended, and do not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system substantially simultaneously; and decoding said speech using said speaker specific speech recognition system with a speaker model
 5 for an identified speaker until there is a speaker change, as required by independent claims 15, 27, and 33, as amended.

Additional Cited References

Baker was also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of the step of manually selecting an alternate decoded output if said assigned output is incorrect.

10 Applicants note that Baker is directed to

recognizing a speech sample with a “computer system by processing the speech sample with at least two speech recognizers, each of which has a different performance characteristic. One speech recognizer may be a large-vocabulary, continuous speech recognizer optimized for real-time
 15 responsiveness and another speech recognizer may be an offline recognizer optimized for high accuracy.”

(See, Abstract.)

Baker does not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker independent
 20 speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is unknown, and does not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker specific speech recognition system with a speaker model for an identified speaker until there is a speaker change.

Thus, Baker does not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a
 25 plurality of speech decoders, each of said decoders using a speaker model corresponding to a different one of said speakers and generating a confidence score for each decoded output, as required by independent claims 1, 19, and 31, as amended, does not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system substantially simultaneously and decoding
 30 said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is unknown, as required by independent claims 11, 23, and 32, as amended, and does not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system substantially simultaneously; and decoding said speech using said speaker specific speech

recognition system with a speaker model for an identified speaker until there is a speaker change, as required by independent claims 15, 27, and 33, as amended.

Chao Chang et al. were also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of the step of presenting said decoded output as a string of words if said corresponding confidence score is below a certain threshold. Applicants note that Chao Chang et al. is directed to a "method and apparatus for processing and interpreting natural language which enhances the operation through the use of semantic confidence values to enhance efficiency" (col. 1, lines 24-26.) Chao Chang et al. do not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is unknown, and do not disclose or suggest decoding said speech using said speaker specific speech recognition system with a speaker model for an identified speaker until there is a speaker change.

Thus, Chao Chang et al. do not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a plurality of speech decoders, each of said decoders using a speaker model corresponding to a different one of said speakers and generating a confidence score for each decoded output, as required by independent claims 1, 19, and 31, as amended, do not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system substantially simultaneously and decoding said speech using said speaker independent speech recognition system whenever the identity of the current speaker is unknown, as required by independent claims 11, 23, and 32, as amended, and do not disclose or suggest providing said speech to a speaker independent speech recognition system and a speaker specific speech recognition system substantially simultaneously; and decoding said speech using said speaker specific speech recognition system with a speaker model for an identified speaker until there is a speaker change, as required by independent claims 15, 27, and 33, as amended.

Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-26, and 28-30

Dependent 2, 4, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garudadri et al., claims 12-14, 16-18, 24-26, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murveit et al., claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of

Baker, claims 3, 10, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Murveit et al., and claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Chao Chang et al.

Claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-26, and 28-30 are dependent on
5 claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 27, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished
over Garudadri et al., Murveit et al., Baker, and Chao Chang et al. (alone or in any
combination) because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 11, 15,
19, 23, and 27 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add
in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claim 9
10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the
base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-33, are in condition for allowance
and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further
15 suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to
contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 17, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560